

## **APPENDIX B – SCOPING MEETING**



**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone Number and E-mail</b>
Bob Anderson	United Winegrowers	P.O. Box 382 Santa Rosa, CA 95402	<a href="mailto:b.anderson@comcast.net">b.anderson@comcast.net</a>
Roland Sanford	Mendocino County Water Agency	890 N. Bush Street Ukiah, CA 95482	(707) 463-4014 <a href="mailto:sanfordr@co.mendocino.ca.us">sanfordr@co.mendocino.ca.us</a>
Bill Price	Stryker Sonoma Winery	5110 Highway 128 Geyserville, CA 95441	<a href="mailto:Bill@strykersonoma.com">Bill@strykersonoma.com</a>
Steve Smit	CSA	8000 Highway 128 Healdsburg, CA 95448	
Bob Ponzo		11765 Old Redwood Highway Healdsburg, CA 95448	
Justin Miller	Grower	P.O. Box 444 Geyserville, CA 95441	
Wes Caldwell	Grower	5301 Highway 128 Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-1412

**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone Number and E-mail</b>
Bernie Scarinzi	Self	P.O. Box 356 Healdsburg, CA 95448	
The gentleman who signed in at this line realized he was at the wrong meeting and asked to be removed from the list.			
Alfred. de Lorimier	Self	2350 Geysers Road Geyserville, CA 95441	
Eric Smith	Landowner	881 Dry Creek Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	<a href="mailto:pugsleap@comcast.net">pugsleap@comcast.net</a>
Tom Todd		22500 River Road Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 849-5028
Marie and Jack Rist	Self	P.O. Box 1003 Healdsburg, CA 95448	
Bill and Linda Esselstein	Self	10300 Highway 128 Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 473-0665

**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone Number and E-mail</b>
Larry Cadd		3650 Highway 128 Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 857-3232 <a href="mailto:cadd@vbbn.com">cadd@vbbn.com</a>
Pete Lescure	Lescure Engineers	4635 Old Redwood Highway Santa Rosa, CA 95403	(707) 575-3427 <a href="mailto:plescure@lescu-engineers.com">plescure@lescu-engineers.com</a>
Sean Swift	The Bishop's Ranch	5297 Westside Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-2440 ext. 110 <a href="mailto:sswift@sonic.net">sswift@sonic.net</a>
Reta Munselle	Wasson Vineyards Munselle Vineyards	3660 Highway 128 Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 857-3660 <a href="mailto:Reta@vbbn.com">Reta@vbbn.com</a>
Bret Munselle	Wasson Vineyards Munselle Vineyards	3674 Highway 128 Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 857-4234
Ron Dick	Belle Terre Ranch	8239 Highway 128 Healdsburg, CA 95448	
Dwight Monson	Monson Vineyards	3400 Geyser Road Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 857-3508 <a href="mailto:dl7monson@aol.com">dl7monson@aol.com</a>

**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone Number and E-mail</b>
Pete Jelton		28588 River Road Cloverdale, CA 95425	(707) 894-3790 <a href="mailto:peter@compoweb.com">peter@compoweb.com</a>
Margaret Marthico		25 Richardson Road Hove BN35RB, U.K.	
Nancy Citro	Westside Community Association	4160 Westside Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-2928 <a href="mailto:citro@sonic.net">citro@sonic.net</a>
George Clough		P.O. Box 2201 Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-6964
Allan F. Nelson		3550 Wine Creek Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-5324
Richard Rued		3863 Dry Creek Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-1564
Mark Bailey	Jordan Winery	P.O. Box 878 Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 431-5248

**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone Number and E-mail</b>
Charles J. Abbe	Abbe Ranch	2445 Westside Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 696-2240 <a href="mailto:jay.abbe@L-3com.com">jay.abbe@L-3com.com</a>
Ralph Bright	Rancher	11950 Old Redwood Highway Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 431-1451
Harry Black	Rancho Miguel	4849 Highway 128 Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 431-8080
Dennis Murphy	Murphy/Goode	4950 West Soda Rock Lane Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-6371
Jennifer Becnel Hamelburg	Becnel Family Vineyards	P.O. Box 1094 Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 431-7686
Don and Judy Mills	Rancher Wine Storage	18850 Hassett Lane Geyserville, CA 95441	(707) 433-7818
Dorothy Olson Hashaw	Olson Family Vineyards	1103 West Dry Creek Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-3256

**Sonoma County Water Agency  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
Public Scoping Meeting  
February 16, 2006**

Name	Affiliation	Address	Phone Number and E-mail
Caroline Draper Swift		5297 Westside Road Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-1043 <a href="mailto:swifties@ev1.net">swifties@ev1.net</a>
Thomas Neville		12106 Old Redwood Highway Healdsburg, CA 95448	(707) 433-5718



## Scoping Meeting Transcript

Presentation

Public Comments

Ralph Bright

Charles Abbe

Sean Swift

Tom Neville

Pete Lescure

Allan Nelson

Dennis Murphy

Richard Rued

Carolyn Draper Swift



0001

1 Scoping Meeting  
2 Sonoma County Water Agency  
3  
4 In the Matter regarding:  
North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project  
5  
6  
7

8 Conducted by  
Sonoma County Water Agency Staff:  
DAVID CUNEO  
9 KEVIN BOOKER  
10  
11

12 Thursday, February 16, 2006  
7:00 p.m.  
13  
14  
15

Held at:  
16 ALEXANDER VALLEY COMMUNITY HALL  
5512 Highway 128  
17 Healdsburg, California  
18  
19

20 REPORTED BY: ELLEN BOLTON  
21  
22 GOLDEN GATE REPORTERS, LLC  
35 Mitchell Boulevard, Suite 8  
23 San Rafael, CA 94903-2010  
(415) 491-4611 \* 1-800-442-4611  
24 FAX (415) 491-4635  
25

0002

1  
2 A P P E A R A N C E S

3  
4 SONOMA COUNTY WATER AGENCY STAFF: DAVID CUNEO  
KEVIN BOOKER  
5 BILL KEENE  
6  
7 PUBLIC COMMENTS GIVEN BY: RALPH BRIGHT  
CHARLES ABBE  
8 SEAN SWIFT  
TOM NEVILLE  
9 PETE LESCURE  
ALLAN NELSON  
10 DENNIS MURPHY  
RICHARD RUED  
11 CAROLYN DRAPER SWIFT  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0003

1 MR. CUNEO: Welcome to the Scoping Meeting for  
2 the North Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project.  
3 We're going to start tonight with a brief introduction,  
4 and then move on to a brief Project description and a  
5 quick summary of the environmental process, and then  
6 move on to taking public comments. My name is Dave  
7 Cuneo. I'm with the Sonoma County Water Agency, and I  
8 work in the Water Agency's Environmental Compliance  
9 Section, and I'm overseeing the contract, the consultant  
10 contract, for doing the Environmental Analysis for the  
11 North Sonoma County Project. With me tonight is Kevin  
12 Booker from our Engineering staff. The Sonoma County  
13 Water Agency is the local sponsor, the local public  
14 agency sponsor for the North Sonoma County Agricultural  
15 Reuse Project, and we also have the Bureau of  
16 Reclamation listed on there, and they are the federal  
17 sponsor for this Project. They are providing funding  
18 for the Feasibility Study for this Project. And with  
19 that I'd like to turn it over to Kevin to give a brief  
20 engineering discussion.

21 MR. BOOKER: Much of my presentation is  
22 actually in this back sheet which is on that back table,  
23 so if you don't understand or if you miss something,  
24 grab that sheet. Also I have business cards back there.  
25 Down the road, if you have a question, you're welcome to  
0004

1 call me and we can talk about the Project, at least the  
2 engineering portion of the Project. So what I'm going  
3 to talk about today is the background, basically, of how  
4 the Project came into existence, and then I'll talk  
5 about some of the objectives and benefits of the  
6 Project. I'll list the stakeholders and sort of do a  
7 quick summary about the Feasibility Study, and then I'll  
8 turn it back over to Dave. So for the regulatory  
9 concerns, back before 1997, federal and state agencies  
10 have expressed concern about potential impacts to  
11 fishery resources and habitats in the Russian River and  
12 its tributaries, so as a result of that the agency  
13 held a Recycled Water Workshop in 1997, and at this  
14 workshop the agency worked with environmental groups,  
15 agricultural, and local public agencies to evaluate the  
16 feasibility of a recycled water distribution system in  
17 Sonoma County. Out of that workshop, Alexander, Russian  
18 River, and Dry Creek Valleys were identified as  
19 potential recipients of recycled water for agricultural  
20 uses. Since then, the agency has been working with other  
21 public agencies, the City of Santa Rosa, the Town of

22 Windsor, and other interested parties such as the  
23 Coalition for Sustainable Agricultural, which is back  
24 there, to develop this North Sonoma County Agricultural  
25 Reuse Project. So some of the objectives -- as I said

0005

1 before, there's more on this sheet, it's at that back  
2 table -- but a few of the objectives are to maintain  
3 stream flows in the Russian River and its tributaries,  
4 to offset agricultural surface and groundwater  
5 diversions, to provide a reliable water supply for  
6 agricultural interests, and to maximize the use of  
7 recycled water. Now, some of the benefits are to  
8 improve the runoff conditions in the Russian River  
9 watershed, to protect and enhance natural resources so  
10 that that may benefit the recovery effort for existing  
11 fish species, and also to provide flexibility for  
12 existing and future regulatory requirements. Right here  
13 are the current Project stakeholders are the Water  
14 Agency, the Airport/Larkfield Sanitation Zone, the City  
15 of Santa Rosa, the Town of Windsor, and the Coalition  
16 for Sustainable Agricultural, and other potential  
17 participants include the City of Healdsburg, the City of  
18 Cloverdale, Geyserville Sanitation Zone, and any other  
19 agricultural -- well, it says agricultural water users,  
20 but anybody else in the public that wants to be a part  
21 of our group and attend some of our meetings, you're  
22 welcome to come. As Dave mentioned before, the Water  
23 Agency has received funding to help prepare this  
24 Feasibility Study, not quite -- probably like a  
25 45 percent match from the Bureau of Reclamation, so

0006

1 they're our federal sponsor, and under the Title XVI  
2 program under the Bureau of Reclamation, the Feasibility  
3 Study has three components: An Engineering Analysis; a  
4 Financial Analysis; and an Environmental Analysis. So  
5 right now we'll look at the benefits and costs of  
6 supplying recycled water to the three different valleys,  
7 and that Analysis hasn't started yet. That's  
8 anticipated to begin mid this year. The Engineering  
9 Analysis, we've completed a Feasibility Study, the  
10 engineering portion, and as a part of that study, we  
11 analyzed over 40 reservoir sites. We identified  
12 pipeline routes and pipeline sizes. We also identified  
13 over 20,000 acres of potential land that could use  
14 recycled water, and we also evaluated the availability  
15 of recycled water from right now the three primary  
16 participants, which is the Airport/Larkfield/Wikiup  
17 Sanitation Zone, the City of Santa Rosa, and the Town  
18 of Windsor. So as I said before, the Engineering  
19 Feasibility Study has been completed. It's been  
20 submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation for comments, and  
21 that's where that's at right now. Somebody earlier had  
22 asked, well, when are you going to release it? Well,  
23 until the Environment Analysis is done, the engineering  
24 report won't be released. Through the Environmental  
25 Analysis environmental impacts could come up, or one of

0007

1 the alternatives could be identified where we'd have  
2 to revise that report, and so that actually concludes my  
3 portion of the study. Again, I just want to reiterate  
4 that much of what I've talked about is on that table  
5 back there, and I also have business cards back there if  
6 down the road you want to call me, and I'll turn it back  
7 to Dave.

8 MR. CUNEO: Okay. I'm going to give a brief  
9 discussion of the Environmental Documentation Process.  
10 We're having prepared what's referred to as a joint NEPA  
11 and CEQA document, and NEPA stands for the National  
12 Environmental Policy Act and it's federal law, and CEQA  
13 stands for the California Environmental Quality Act,  
14 which is a state law. And the purpose of these two laws  
15 is to inform decision makers in the public of potential  
16 environmental impacts of projects, to identify  
17 alternatives or ways to reduce potential environmental  
18 impacts, and to provide the public input into the  
19 decision-making process, and why are we using, or why do  
20 we have to comply with both the state and federal laws?  
21 Any time a local or state agency determines to do an  
22 action or provide funding for a project, they have to  
23 comply with the state California Environmental Quality  
24 Act. Our agency, the Sonoma County Water Agency, is a  
25 local public agency and our proposal to do the North

0008

1 Sonoma County Agricultural Reuse Project triggers the  
2 need to do CEQA review. Similarly, under the federal  
3 NEPA law, the federal agencies have the same requirement  
4 where any time a federal agency decides to approve a  
5 project or provide funding for a project, they have to  
6 comply with NEPA. So for this Project, the Bureau of  
7 Reclamation is providing funding for the Feasibility  
8 Study. That triggers the requirement for NEPA review  
9 for the Bureau. For this particular Project, we've  
10 determined that we will be preparing what's referred to  
11 as an Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA, or EIS,  
12 and an Environmental Impact Report under CEQA, or an  
13 EIR. These will be one document but prepared in a  
14 manner that meets the requirements of both the state and  
15 federal laws. Where we're at right now in the process  
16 is we've just issued a Notice of Intent, or NOI, which  
17 is the term under the NEPA law, and a Notice of  
18 Preparation, or NOP, which is the requirement to meet  
19 the -- or the term under CEQA. Those notices are what  
20 just went out that said we are embarking on this  
21 Environmental Review Process and that we're preparing  
22 these environmental documents.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could I ask who those  
24 went to?

25  
0009

1 Project mailing list, which is -- I can't remember the  
2 exact number, but there was 2,000 people in the area,  
3 and went to state agencies, it's filed at the County  
4 Clerk's office, and it goes to the state clearinghouse,  
5 and they disseminate it to different state agencies,

6 also. The Notice of Intent is the document that the  
7 Bureau -- it's a part of their NEPA process -- has  
8 published in a publication called the Federal Register,  
9 and that got published there. It's not as widely  
10 distributed as the NOP is, but they essentially have the  
11 same documentation, and the NOI in the Federal Register  
12 is what the NEPA requirement is. That's where it's  
13 published.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the NOP, does it go  
15 to everybody that has an address within the Project  
16 area, or just the people that own their own homes?

17 MR. CUNEO: We mailed it out to -- Kevin, you  
18 can correct me if I'm wrong, but --

19 MR. BOOKER: We mailed it out to all --

20 MR. CUNEO: -- the property owners within the  
21 study boundary.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So anybody that pays  
23 taxes within the boundary got one?

24 MR. BOOKER: Right.

25 MR. CUNEO: And that's the boundary that's

0010

1 shown on the map back there. Is that the same boundary,  
2 or --

3 MR. BOOKER: Essentially. Probably. It's  
4 bigger than that. It includes those areas but even the  
5 pieces that are in the middle that are not highlighted.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it had nothing to do  
7 with whether property owners were either close or not  
8 close to possible reservoir sites, pumping stations, but  
9 rather all property owners in that mapped area?

10 MR. CUNEO: Well, because part of the Project  
11 is providing water to, for users in the area, it sort of  
12 encompassed the whole area, not just the physical  
13 facilities of pipelines or the pump stations.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So all property owners?

15 MR. CUNEO: Yeah. But as happens with every  
16 project, there is a possibility that someone didn't get  
17 a notice out there. Mailing lists aren't perfect, and  
18 certainly this is still early in our review process, so  
19 if you didn't get a mailing from this, make sure you get  
20 on our mailing list so that later steps in this process  
21 that you will be getting notice. So then, once the  
22 draft Environmental Report comes out, people again have  
23 an opportunity to review that document, and that's going  
24 to be the detailed analysis of what the environmental  
25 impacts of the proposed Project would be, and people

0011

1 would have the opportunity to comment on that and send  
2 in their comments to us. Again, we'll have a public  
3 hearing during that process, and that will be before our  
4 Board of Directors, and then once all those comments  
5 come in during the review period for that document,  
6 we'll have to respond to all the comments that come in  
7 and prepare a final Environment Impact Report and a  
8 final EIS, also. And once that final has been prepared,  
9 we'll take that to our Board for certification, and  
10 certification is a term under CEQA where our Boards make

11 a determination that the document was prepared in  
12 accordance with the requirements of CEQA. Under the  
13 federal NEPA side of it, the Bureau will go through a  
14 similar process. They refer to that as making a Record  
15 of Decision, and again, right now we're at the NOI/NOP  
16 point in the process, and the purpose of that document  
17 right now is to inform other agencies and the public of  
18 the upcoming document, and if you request comments from  
19 people, to submit comments regarding the scope of the  
20 analysis they'd like to see, and any alternatives to the  
21 Project. They'd also like to see us include the comment  
22 period for this NOI/NOP that just went out. It began  
23 January 26, 2006, and goes through March 15, 2006.  
24 During that comment period, we're also holding one  
25 Scoping meeting, which is tonight's meeting right here,

0012

1 the purpose of that is to obtain comments on the scope  
2 of the Project and range of the environmental impacts to  
3 be included in the Environmental Analysis. The things  
4 we're looking for from people as far as comments  
5 include, but certainly are not limited to, are about  
6 asking key questions to be addressed in the EIS/EIR,  
7 preferences on alternatives, additional alternatives for  
8 the agency to consider, and concerns regarding  
9 environmental impacts of the Project. Public comments  
10 can be submitted to me. The notice -- the contact  
11 information that is on the wall here is also in the  
12 Notice of Preparation that everyone should have, and if  
13 you don't, there are extra copies here, I think at the  
14 back table there that everyone should get. Comments can  
15 be mailed in to me, or they can be faxed in, or if you  
16 have access to the Internet, we have an agency website  
17 where comments can be filled in online, and we're also  
18 providing this forum here for people who want to provide  
19 oral comments to stand up today and make those comments.  
20 This forum isn't set up for -- at this point -- for  
21 question/answer period, but if people want to have  
22 comments that you want to make, we'll take it back then,  
23 and then include or consider for our analysis. And I  
24 think with that, I think we'll head into the comment  
25 period. Actually, he had his hand up first, back there.

0013

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just quickly, I want to  
2 interject that we have the comment cards as well.

3 MR. CUNEO: Okay. Did everyone hear that as  
4 well? We have comments cards here that people can fill  
5 out and submit comments here in writing today, but  
6 again, comments can be submitted all the way through  
7 March 15. If we're moving into the comment phase, then  
8 can I have everyone who wants to make a comment state  
9 their name for the record, and then if any affiliation  
10 you're with if you have that, and then just say your  
11 comments and we'll get those recorded here. We have a  
12 court reporter here that's going to take down everyone's  
13 comments so we get exactly in your words what you want  
14 to have submitted.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Ralph



16 Bright. In this document that was mailed to us,  
17 Agricultural Reuse Project, many times in the context of  
18 this you use the term "proposed" Project area. How can  
19 you have a Environmental Impact Report that needs to be  
20 finite if you're only talking about "proposed" area, and  
21 number two, I think is incumbent upon whoever is -- I  
22 assume this is Sonoma County Water Agency. Every  
23 property owner in this proposed area is listed as a  
24 taxpayer, property tax payer, with the County of Sonoma,  
25 and there shouldn't be any guessing as to whether or not

0014

1 we're going to get these reports.

2 MR. CUNEO: I think both those comments  
3 address the process of what we go through, and I think  
4 that is something I can answer up here tonight. As far  
5 as referring to something as "proposed," I think that  
6 anything that we have in here is proposed and potential  
7 until our Board, who is our ultimate decision-maker for  
8 us, actually selects a project and then it becomes a  
9 project. Up until that time, it's just something we're  
10 proposing. It's not definite. It's something that can  
11 change during the Environmental Review Process, or  
12 during the Engineering Feasibility Study, or even during  
13 the Economic Analysis for the Project. So I think  
14 that's why we refer to everything as "proposed." It's  
15 not something that's -- nothing's a given at this point.  
16 I don't know if that answers your question.

17 RALPH BRIGHT: How could you write an Impact  
18 Report if you don't have a finite proposal, a finite  
19 plan?

20 MR. CUNEO: Well, we have proposed locations  
21 for things. We can go out and look at those, but as far  
22 as it being a definite, this is a definite route we're  
23 going, that decision hasn't been made. So we can go out  
24 and look at certain routes or swaths of routes, say,  
25 look at a corridor along this route or something like

0015

1 that, and it's possible to go out and look at it.  
2 Whether or not that is what actually what gets selected  
3 or not, that's up in the air still, and then as far as  
4 the second part of your question with the property tax  
5 rolls, that is correct. We have access to property tax  
6 rolls, and I think where some of confusion may come in  
7 is where the boundaries are drawn for where we select to  
8 look for pulling that mailing list from, and it could be  
9 someone we think a boundary for the Project is on one  
10 roadway, and there may be someone who lives somewhere  
11 else but they want to be included in the Project, they  
12 may get left out of it because we put a boundary of  
13 where we're going to pull our property, or the mailing  
14 list boundary. We set up an arbitrary boundary that  
15 didn't catch everyone. So it's something that happens.  
16 You can't get everyone all the time. We try our best,  
17 though.

18 RALPH BRIGHT: You've constructed maps over  
19 here of the area, and that would seem incumbent upon you  
20 to notify all those property owners in that area.

21 MR. CUNEO: And I'd have to go back and --  
22 MR. BOOKER: That was done. That was done.  
23 MR. CUNEO: To our knowledge that was done,  
24 but what I'm saying is there could be somebody in there  
25 that got missed by some error. I don't know if that has

0016

1 happened or not, I'm just saying that that's a  
2 possibility.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Charles  
4 Abbe, Abbe Ranch. I would like to follow up on the  
5 comment this gentleman made. I, too, am struggling with  
6 the idea of how one writes an EIR and does Economic  
7 Analysis and the Environmental Analysis until one -- one  
8 has to examine some very specific proposals. One might  
9 get a very different answer as to both economics as well  
10 as the Environmental Impact if a 1,000 acre foot  
11 reservoir is here, versus here, versus here, versus over  
12 at the City of Healdsburg. They're all so varied  
13 locations (inaudible), but it seems to me to write -- to  
14 move it from generalities to specific economic impacts,  
15 one has to really pick scenarios, specific scenarios,  
16 perhaps alternative ones as you suggest, but I would  
17 encourage you to -- I don't see how you do it without  
18 picking very specific locations to analyze from an  
19 engineering point of view, from an economic point of  
20 view, and so forth. So I echo this gentleman's comment.

21 MR. CUNEO: Yes?

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Sean Swift.  
23 I'm from The Bishop's Ranch as well as being a resident  
24 of the Project area, and the dilemma for me is that the  
25 Project area's huge and there are no specifics now, but

0017

1 you started what's essentially the legal part of the  
2 Project by having a Scoping meeting. You're not giving  
3 us any specifics that we can respond to, but the clock  
4 is ticking, and at some point you're going say that, you  
5 know, if you get to the EIR and they certify the EIR,  
6 then we can't bring up new things because the process  
7 has gone along that far, but if we haven't got specifics  
8 until that point, then you've sort of shown that we've  
9 had this big long time to look at it, but actually the  
10 time we've to had look at it is very small and very  
11 compact, it might be during Christmas or something like  
12 that. So for you the process is working according to  
13 the law, but from what I'm seeing the process is  
14 inadequate for me to actually understand what the  
15 impacts of the Project are because it's not specific.  
16 You're looking at an immense area where the soils are so  
17 different from one spot to another that, you know, we  
18 just don't really, you know, if you're talking about a  
19 reservoir or a pipeline, that we just can't really  
20 respond at this point and yet, yet we're sort of  
21 expected to under CEQA, and then a specific question:  
22 Is this a Project level EIR or a program level EIR?

23 MR. CUNEO: It's going to be Project level.

24 SEAN SWIFT: Project level. So at some point  
25 you're going to say, you're going to say -- at what

0018

1 point are you going to say the reservoir is going to be  
2 exactly here, and the pipeline's going to be exactly  
3 there, that we're asking you to comment on. At what  
4 point that is going to happen?

5 MR. CUNEO: At that point is going to be when  
6 we come out with the draft Environment Impact Report,  
7 Environmental Impact Statement.

8 SEAN SWIFT: And how long from that point  
9 until it's certified? How long is that period?

10 MR. CUNEO: It's not a set time period. It's  
11 really dependent on what the range of comments are that  
12 come in and what we need to address in response to those  
13 comments that come in.

14 SEAN SWIFT: My other comment is if you could  
15 release that engineering portion of the Feasibility  
16 Study as soon as possible so that the public could start  
17 to assimilate that information, that would be very  
18 helpful.

19 MR. CUNEO: Okay. In the back there.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Tom Neville.  
21 I live south of US 1 on Redwood Highway, and I bring in  
22 some food for thought here. First, I want to give a  
23 little history of pipeline and what's happened. It was  
24 supposed to go on Chalk Hill Road first. People up  
25 there bitched and bitched. Now on account of that, it

0019

1 has to go under the Russian River two different places  
2 in case of a big flood or (inaudible) or backup, or if  
3 that ever breaks, both these places are upwater from  
4 where, Wohler Bridge, where Santa Rosa gets its drinking  
5 water. If something would happen now, it would really  
6 pollute their drinking water. Another question that I  
7 would like to bring up here is why is Dry Creek south of  
8 Healdsburg when they could get water out of the dam?  
9 When they're near to the dam, why would they have to  
10 have this? Now in case there was a backup and  
11 pollution, as has happened in the past and they plugged  
12 it, it would -- the water in that area would go on the  
13 ground where they'd do the irrigation and flow right  
14 back into the Russian River again and then pollute the  
15 water supply in Santa Rosa. So that's why I'm saying  
16 why those two places? Why can't we get water from the  
17 dam, good, clean water?

18 MR. CUNEO: Kevin, do you want to -- that  
19 speaks to one of the purposes of the Project.

20 MR. BOOKER: The reason you can't take water  
21 out of the dam is because of water rights and  
22 appropriation, and -- what is it -- Lake Sonoma, some of  
23 that water is reserved for fishery, and so because of  
24 that you can't take water out of the dam. Another  
25 reason -- well, but anyway.

0020

1 MR. CUNEO: Well, I was going say that --

2 MR. BOOKER: To take water -- there's only so  
3 much water. There's only so much, and through law only  
4 so much can be taken out of the river, right? And so as

5 a result of that, with all the farms, the vineyards, or  
6 whatever, along the -- let's just say the Dry Creek,  
7 right -- most of that has already been appropriated, so  
8 the water in the dam has other -- well, there's other  
9 uses for that water, and that's not up to us to say.

10 TOM NEVILLE: I'm also worried about what goes  
11 through the Russian River twice through the pipeline and  
12 so, now if it floods up there where it was originally  
13 put, the water would diversify until there was a break  
14 in the pipeline, and it would flood the different  
15 vineyards, and by the time it hits the Russian River, it  
16 would be pretty well diversified. It wouldn't have  
17 pollution built up into it. But now it's in the river  
18 twice and above where people could get water supplies  
19 for Santa Rosa, you know, it's kind of dangerous, but,  
20 well, I kind of hate to think of the water that they use  
21 for irrigation near the Russian River because if  
22 something did go wrong, if there was a backup of  
23 pollution, it would just go right back into the Russian  
24 River again, and these things you're proposing, is there  
25 anything to guarantee that that would be pure water?

0021

1 MR. CUNEO: I don't think that's anything we  
2 can address tonight. I think that's something that we  
3 can include in the comments submitted, but it's not  
4 something we have the information here that we can  
5 address tonight. I think he had his hand up next.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Pete  
7 Lescure. I'm a principal with Lescure Engineers. As  
8 far as comments, the City of Santa Rosa tried this a  
9 number of years ago, to put reservoirs out there and get  
10 the agriculturists to use the water, and it fell apart  
11 as I understand basically because of the type of  
12 arrangements they wanted to enter into with the users,  
13 payment and et cetera, and I hope that you're looking at  
14 that as a historical lesson to learn from and how  
15 perhaps to do it differently as part of the way you're  
16 setting up the program for the users, and I understand  
17 they had problems trying to site the big reservoirs that  
18 was economically viable, too, but anyway, the point is I  
19 hope you look back on the history and learn a little bit  
20 from their lessons and do it differently so we don't end  
21 up in the same boat.

22 MR. CUNEO: I like to think we learn.

23 PETE LESCURE: So the question would be have  
24 you specifically looked back at the City of Santa Rosa's  
25 efforts and interviewed Miles Ferris and other folks

0022

1 like that to see where they felt their program fell  
2 apart? It was an effort similar to this.

3 RALPH BRIGHT: The South County dairy industry  
4 wouldn't let the reservoirs in there.

5 PETE LESCURE: Essentially, yes.

6 RALPH BRIGHT: Two Rock, or his brother,  
7 wanted to put a lot of -- and they couldn't make it, and  
8 I really feel that Santa Rosa is not being totally  
9 honest in what you're saying here. My personal opinion

10 is that you're looking for someplace to put water so  
11 Santa Rosa can continue to grow. It's not a benevolence  
12 on the part of Santa Rosa.

13 MR. CUNEO: I don't think that's anything -- I  
14 can't speak to what Santa Rosa's --

15 RALPH BRIGHT: Well, what is the reason for  
16 the Project?

17 MR. CUNEO: Our reason, as Kevin said, is to  
18 offset the use of water that's in rivers and groundwater  
19 by providing an alternative source of water for those  
20 existing water users that are out there.

21 RALPH BRIGHT: So you're saying that all the  
22 water that is coming through this pipeline at this very  
23 moment is going to be bled off into these reservoirs and  
24 not go to the Geysers?

25 MR. CUNEO: I don't think that's part of the

0023

1 Project. My understanding -- I mean, I can't speak to  
2 what the City's contracts are, but my understanding is  
3 that they have contracts with sending water to the  
4 Geysers, but they have excess water out there that would  
5 be available for agricultural (inaudible).

6 RALPH BRIGHT: You say "excess water." Is it  
7 before the area continues to expand to the south of us  
8 or after?

9 MR. CUNEO: I don't know. I can't speak to  
10 the specifics of that, but if that's something that you  
11 want us to include sort of as more of an explanation.

12 RALPH BRIGHT: I'm skeptical enough to believe  
13 it's not being honest with us. Not you, the Project.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Allan Nelson. From the  
15 Agency's point of view, as far as this water goes, is it  
16 going to be voluntary, or once they construct this  
17 pipeline, which is supposed to be quite dollar  
18 intensive, it's going to be voluntary or every guy along  
19 the line has got to take it? What's their stance?

20 MR. CUNEO: As far as I know, it is a  
21 voluntary process.

22 ALLAN NELSON: You'll give your John Henry on  
23 to that, right?

24 MR. CUNEO: I'm not sure if mine would do you  
25 any good, though.

0024

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the projected  
2 cost of this shooting match, roughly?

3 MR. BOOKER: If you look back here on the  
4 table, there's an Executive Summary that has estimated  
5 costs.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tell us the number,  
7 roughly.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: More or less.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is it?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ballpark.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Per acre foot.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you get it and show  
13 it to us, please?

14 MR. BOOKER: This is actually -- we're not

15 really here to answer questions. If you have a  
16 question, you know, just say it as a comment, and we  
17 will be happy to answer it in the EIR, but I will answer  
18 it. The estimated Project cost is 375 million.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the water is  
20 supposed to be super clean, right?

21 MR. BOOKER: The water is tertiary --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just out of curiosity,  
23 if it's that clean, why can't we just put it right back  
24 in the Russian River and let it go right on out to the  
25 ocean instead of bringing it up here? Now, I know there

0025

1 is a lot of people who can use it, and I'm not against,  
2 but there's a lot of places along the line that has  
3 adequate water, and it's clean water under the ground,  
4 and basically what the Water Agency is talking about  
5 doing is having us slow down pumping and you bringing  
6 the water from Santa Rosa up here.

7 MR. BOOKER: I'm just going to --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe you should freeze  
9 it and ship it up to the North Pole for the Eskimos.  
10 They could use it for ice.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Bill Keene  
12 from Sonoma County Water Agency, and I think you guys  
13 are all asking really great questions, and the purpose  
14 of our meeting tonight is to really hear from you about  
15 what your -- what kinds of information would you like to  
16 see us cover in the EIR. We're not prepared to answer  
17 all those questions because that's why we're doing this  
18 report. We're just starting, so I think you're asking  
19 questions that ideally, you know, when we get to the  
20 draft EIR/EIS stage you can look at that document, did  
21 we answer those questions, did we answer the mail of the  
22 questions that you asked tonight? And so, I continue to  
23 ask those -- I continue to urge you to ask questions,  
24 make comments about what you'd like to see us look at in  
25 our EIR/EIS and we'll take that down. We have a court

0026

1 reporter here, but I think you're asking questions we're  
2 not even there yet, you know, so be patient with us. I  
3 wish we had all the answers, we don't. But ideally when  
4 you get to the draft EIR/EIS, you'll see those questions  
5 answered, and if you don't see them answered, then  
6 that's the time, again, our second point of public  
7 input, where you then can ask that question again, and  
8 we'll have to answer the mail at that point for sure.  
9 So again, please keep making questions and comments.  
10 Again, not going to be able to answer those tonight, but  
11 we are listening. We're taking everything you say word  
12 for word, and we'll be using that as we develop our  
13 draft document.

14 RALPH BRIGHT: And at that point is the horse  
15 still in the barn?

16 MR. KEENE: Absolutely. Again, tonight we're  
17 just getting information from you guys in order to help  
18 us as we write our environmental document. We'll have a  
19 draft EIR/EIS. Again, you'll have a chance to make

20 public comment, and at such time we go to our Board to  
21 certify our environmental document, that's also a public  
22 hearing, another opportunity for folks to make public  
23 comments, and only when our Board has made the decision  
24 to certify the document and then ultimately approve the  
25 Project, a separate decision, that's when we've selected

0027

1 a Project. And we're nowhere near that at this point.  
2 Yes?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dennis Murphy with  
4 Murphy/Goode Winery. In the past, the Water Agency,  
5 whether it's been repair and restoration or stream bank  
6 improvements, there's always been an issue about  
7 easements, and I think it will come up again with the  
8 pipeline. Easements are always a question with property  
9 owners. In the past, I know, with the last project  
10 there was a desire for the Water Agency to own the  
11 easements outright as in Fee Simple, and that might --  
12 that may, might be fine in that situation. In the  
13 situation here where you're going to be going across  
14 farmlands, I don't know how you're going to deal with  
15 Points of Diversion or anything else. My opinion would  
16 be that it would be better to work with a real easement  
17 as opposed to an outright procurement so that -- because  
18 you don't split up cropland.

19 MR. CUNEO: Sure.

20 DENNIS MURPHY: And I know there's been a  
21 reluctance in the past by the Agency to kind of  
22 acquiesce to that. It would be nice if there was  
23 cooperative use of the land strictly for a pipeline  
24 easement. It could be farmed over the top of.  
25 Vineyards are very accommodating to get back into if

0028

1 there's repair work that needs to be done rather than  
2 cutting this broad swath through the land itself. If  
3 you could go back to the benefits tab that you had up  
4 there, one of them was pretty interesting. The bottom  
5 one, flexibility for future regulatory requirements.  
6 I'd like you to expand on that, if not tonight, sometime  
7 in the future. Exactly what requirements are  
8 anticipated? Are you talking about water requirements,  
9 or waste water requirements that the Agency's going to  
10 have to deal with, or our regulatory requirements that  
11 we're going to have to deal with under the ESA? I'd  
12 like that to be a lot more fully explained because I  
13 would interpret it tonight to mean that the hammer is  
14 going to come down on the wastewater industry again, and  
15 you've got to find a home for it and we're the home,  
16 and -- but there may be mutual benefit to us, too. And  
17 so I'd like that whole column to be expanded.

18 MR. KEENE: Okay. Thanks for your comment.  
19 We appreciate that. This gentleman over here.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yes. Charles  
21 Abbey, again. I would ask the Scope to include the  
22 environment impacts of this tertiary-treated water. I  
23 know Title XXII of the state code says a lot about that  
24 standard. I also know that that standard doesn't

25 necessarily define limits for all chemicals or

0029

1 pharmaceutical chemicals and the like, and I would hope  
2 that the Environmental Impact Statements assesses what  
3 this water contains as opposed to simply presuming it is  
4 a Title XXII tertiary-treated water. I would secondly  
5 ask that the Scope address and include in Environmental  
6 Impacts what I'll call the "aesthetics" of the Project.  
7 Not -- for example, perhaps one the most obvious  
8 aesthetics issues is the fact that these reservoirs by  
9 the end of the summer will be empty, and they will be a  
10 giant mud bowl or dried-out reservoir, in general, and  
11 they will be full and perhaps even attractive by the end  
12 of the winter. So there really are aesthetic impacts to  
13 both landowners who are hosting, if you will, or from  
14 whom you bought land to put a reservoir but also  
15 adjacent to the owners.

16 MR. KEENE: Okay. Thanks a lot. Any other  
17 questions? This gentleman over here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The 375 million, who's  
19 footing the bill there?

20 MR. KEENE: You know, we don't have  
21 information on -- we're so early on right now, we do not  
22 have information on exactly what our funding sources  
23 are.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Any ideas?

25 MR. KEENE: I really couldn't comment on that

0030

1 tonight. That's something we're going to have to look  
2 at. We have not done our Economic Feasibility and  
3 Financial Plans, so that will be forthcoming as part of  
4 our Feasibility Study but nothing we've got for you  
5 tonight. Gentleman next to him.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Richard Rued. I live  
7 in Dry Creek Valley. It seems to me when you come to  
8 a meeting and talk about wastewater, you ought to bring  
9 40 or 50 gallons of it so we can look at it and smell  
10 it. I use it down in Santa Rosa, and when we turn the  
11 pumps on, it stinks. People ought to know that. It  
12 does funny things to my hand. I've had to work at the  
13 Geysers where it's running at. You say the big word,  
14 tertiary, that does not mean it's good, in my opinion.  
15 I use it down there because the City gives it to me  
16 under pressure. I don't have pay for it. It seems to  
17 me if you want to do this, do it the old-fashioned way  
18 and pay, pay us to take it.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ditto.

20 MR. KEENE: Thanks for your comment. You're  
21 dittoing him? Ditto, right.

22 RICHARD RUED: Oh, one more thing. History  
23 repeats itself. I sat through meetings like this at the  
24 Sonoma County Water Agency a little over 30 years ago  
25 telling us what a great benefit the Warm Springs Dam

0031

1 would benefit the residents of Dry Creek Valley because  
2 we'd never have to worry about water. We've never have  
3 bank erosion again. Those two things are wrong. They're



4 trying to take our water away now. We have more erosion  
5 because of the Corps of Engineers than we ever had  
6 before the dam.

7 MR. KEENE: Next comment. Mr. Lescure.

8 PETE LESCURE: Pete Lescure, Lescure  
9 Engineers. I was looking at your Project alternatives,  
10 and they don't seem to span a whole lot. It's either no  
11 Project or the Project with some subsets of it. It  
12 seems like it might be instructive, which is one of the  
13 purposes of the EIR is to discover things and learn and  
14 be instructive, it may be instructive to look at some  
15 things like taking this water to the Geysers or dumping  
16 it in the river, or I don't know, those don't make a  
17 whole lot of sense, but something like this -- these  
18 alternatives seem like pretty narrowly described, and it  
19 seems like it might be beneficial to look a little more  
20 broadly.

21 MR. KEENE: We appreciate any ideas that you  
22 have on alternatives, and if you want to put those in  
23 writing and hand them to us, that would be something  
24 we'd consider.

25 PETE LESCURE: Well, two. To put it back in  
0032

1 the river and ship it to the Geysers, that's two  
2 alternatives.

3 MR. KEENE: Okay. We've got that on the  
4 record. Thank you. Next comment.

5 RALPH BRIGHT: The State of California won't  
6 let you for one thing, and the people in the Guerneville  
7 area won't let you either. We know that. That's why  
8 they can't put it in the river.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, they could put it  
10 in holes alongside the river, like gravel pits, you  
11 know. Ukiah, Cloverdale, and Geyserville do it already.

12 MR. KEENE: Please state your name for the  
13 reporter.

14 DENNIS MURPHY: Dennis Murphy again. I forgot  
15 to ask is there any part of this system that's  
16 eventually going to be enhanced into a two-way type  
17 pipeline where you're also going to pick up water from  
18 the Healdsburg plant and Geyserville or Cloverdale, or  
19 is that the long term -- is that part of this Project or  
20 even a consideration in this Project at all, or is the  
21 Project going to be engineered towards the ability to  
22 accept that kind of thing probably later?

23 MR. KEENE: I am not sure what you're --

24 DENNIS MURPHY: In the two places where you're  
25 picking up wastewater from the various other

0033

1 municipalities along the way, and kind of moving south  
2 with that water and then bringing -- is there both kinds  
3 of systems going to be put in, or is it going to be  
4 capable of both kinds of systems eventually?

5 MR. KEENE: I still don't understand.

6 MR. CUNEO: I think in short that would be  
7 yes, but it depends on those other entities, their  
8 willingness to want to join it.

9 DENNIS MURPHY: But do you think you're  
10 starting the engineering with the thought in mind that  
11 you will be picking up some other municipal  
12 wastewater --  
13 MR. KEENE: Are you asking him if -- we've  
14 noted who our Project partners are at this point.  
15 DENNIS MURPHY: Right. Those cities.  
16 MR. BOOKER: And you're talking about bringing  
17 water from them to the Project area, the three valleys?  
18 DENNIS MURPHY: Well, no. It's a complete  
19 system. Are you also not only bringing wastewater to  
20 these three areas but are you also talking about  
21 receiving wastewater from the municipalities within  
22 those three areas and treating it?  
23 MR. KEENE: You mean --  
24 DENNIS MURPHY: Bringing them into a whole  
25 system.  
0034  
1 MR. KEENE: Receiving it from the lands, the  
2 ag lands?  
3 DENNIS MURPHY: No. Receiving them from the  
4 municipalities.  
5 MR. KEENE: Okay. Well, we've got Windsor.  
6 We've got the City of Santa Rosa, and we've got the  
7 Airport/Larkfield/Wikiup Sanitation Zone. Those are the  
8 three that are our Project partners, and because the  
9 Geysers pipeline runs through these other  
10 municipalities, there is the potential to do that.  
11 We're going to look at that in our EIR.  
12 DENNIS MURPHY: So from the start of, from the  
13 initial concept of the full Project, by the time you're  
14 all done, you are looking long term and also laying a  
15 secondary pipe?  
16 MR. KEENE: Not a secondary pipe. It's just  
17 one -- it's one system that we're looking at.  
18 DENNIS MURPHY: Well, you wouldn't put them in  
19 the same pipe? You wouldn't put the less than  
20 tertiary-treated --  
21 MR. KEENE: Oh, oh, no. I'm sorry. Okay. Now  
22 I understand your question. No, we're not looking at  
23 building two systems. We're looking at building one  
24 system. If a wastewater provider was not at tertiary,  
25 they would need to bring it up to tertiary in order to  
0035  
1 join the Project.  
2 DENNIS MURPHY: So Healdsburg, which is  
3 currently going to have to go tertiary and is probably  
4 going to be exactly the same as --  
5 MR. KEENE: We wouldn't build two different  
6 pipelines, one to serve secondary and one to serve --  
7 DENNIS MURPHY: But they would probably try to  
8 integrate it into the system as well, and likewise  
9 possibly Cloverdale or any other municipality --  
10 MR. KEENE: Or Geyserville, or --  
11 DENNIS MURPHY: And you would engineer towards  
12 that goal, or you would at least think about engineering  
13 toward that goal?

14 MR. CUNEO: We wouldn't be against it.  
15 RICHARD RUED: Richard Rued again. So I could  
16 be wrong about this. Maybe you're addressing the fact  
17 that as we give up irrigation water we take out of the  
18 ground and receive the wastewater so the Sonoma County  
19 Water Agency that sells water to the City of Santa Rosa  
20 so they can continue to build, have you in your EIR  
21 considered the fact of the increased flooding that will  
22 occur because of when they pave the Santa Rosa plain  
23 from Healdsburg to Petaluma, all the water is going to  
24 run off?

25 MR. KEENE: Thanks for your comment. The  
0036

1 gentleman in the back.

2 TOM NEVILLE: I just want to make a comment  
3 that at the time I wrote many letters about changing the  
4 pipeline and about the thing going under the Russian  
5 River twice above where Santa Rosa gets the water. I  
6 told a lot of people in Santa Rosa, and they had the  
7 funniest attitude about this. Every one of them says,  
8 yeah, we want that, boy, when that wastewater gets going  
9 into our water we're going to sue the City and make a  
10 hell of a lot of money off of this. That's why people  
11 in Santa Rosa didn't complain. They're all waiting for  
12 future lawsuits to make money. They want their water  
13 poisoned.

14 MR. KEENE: Next comment.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One thing, Bill. Sean  
16 Swift from The Bishop's Ranch. If you do receive  
17 tertiary water from municipalities that don't have that  
18 capability now, aren't there different levels of  
19 tertiary water, and would you please address that in  
20 the, you know, how tertiary the water will be before it  
21 will be accepted.

22 MR. KEENE: Okay. Thanks for that comment.  
23 That's a good point. Any other comments? Gentleman in  
24 back.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Ron Dick. There's  
0037

1 a growing movement to farm your vineyard organically,  
2 and it's my understanding that this wastewater would  
3 negate that and you wouldn't have your vineyard  
4 certified organic if you use the wastewater, and I  
5 wonder if that's the situation.

6 MR. KEENE: That's something we could --  
7 thanks for putting that in the record. Any other  
8 comments?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another use for your  
10 wastewater, let's just do the freeways. Let's just  
11 irrigate the freeways. They're not organic anyway.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They'd look good green.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. We could chain a  
14 few prisoners to the tractor and let them drive up and  
15 down the road. Get them out of the jails.

16 MR. KEENE: Any other comments at this time?  
17 Hearing none, I guess, we can close this -- okay, sorry,  
18 one more in the back.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Larry Cadd. What are  
20 you going to do, or how do you provide a guaranteed  
21 analysis of the water quality? Because as I understand  
22 it, if it's not diluted with sufficient rainwater, you  
23 can't use it anyway. So how are you going to with high  
24 rainfall, low rainfall, what are we going to get, and  
25 are you going to guarantee what we get when we get this

0038

1 fed to us?

2 MR. KEENE: Okay. Thanks for asking that  
3 question. Gentleman in the front.

4 RALPH BRIGHT: Perhaps I'm being dense, but I  
5 would like one of you folks to stand up and tell us why  
6 this Project is happening, why it's going to happen?  
7 Why?

8 MR. CUNEO: We've got a Notice of Preparation  
9 which explains --

10 RALPH BRIGHT: I don't want any preparation.  
11 I want one of you to stand up and say we're going to put  
12 this Project in, we want this Project in for these  
13 reasons, and I don't care about the slide show.

14 MR. KEENE: Well, what you heard tonight is,  
15 that is where we are. You've heard about the benefits  
16 of the Project, you've heard about the reasons for why  
17 we're doing it --

18 RALPH BRIGHT: Why the Project? Why the  
19 Project?

20 MR. KEENE: It's what you heard tonight.

21 RALPH BRIGHT: What did I hear tonight? Tell  
22 me.

23 MR. KEENE: What you heard tonight is we're  
24 looking at providing recycled water into these three  
25 valley areas.

0039

1 RALPH BRIGHT: Why?

2 MR. KEENE: I have to back up. We've got  
3 these benefits right here. These are our objectives. I  
4 mean, I don't -- that's exactly -- that's what I'm  
5 saying. Is there something there that you don't  
6 understand?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, they have to do  
8 something with the water.

9 RALPH BRIGHT: Shouldn't there be another  
10 reason up there?

11 MR. KEENE: If you think there's another  
12 reason, we'd love to hear it or --

13 RALPH BRIGHT: I've already stated my reason.

14 MR. KEENE: Okay.

15 RALPH BRIGHT: What I thought it was.

16 MR. KEENE: Okay. We've got it in the record.  
17 Gentleman in the back.

18 TOM NEVILLE: The reason that I understood  
19 when this pipeline first started was that some big grape  
20 growers with thousands of acres of grapes -- and at that  
21 time this was going to deplete the water from the  
22 Russian River, put it back in the Eel River, and they  
23 were scared about not being able to pump the water out.

24 So then this was a good idea. Maybe it would be good  
25 for the vineyards (inaudible) it's for a few rich  
0040 people. It would benefit them because, you know, the  
1 Russian River is running out of water. It's what they  
2 wanted. Wine poisons people anyway. What the hell do  
3 they care.  
4  
5 MR. KEENE: Any other comments?  
6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is Caroline  
7 Draper Swift, and I want to -- I'm hoping that if the,  
8 you know, if the reservoirs do get built that it's very  
9 clearly stated who maintains the reservoirs, and who  
10 tests the water and how often, and where we as people  
11 have a vested interest in the quality of the aquifer to  
12 go to, you know, monitor that the testing is being done,  
13 how the reservoir -- how the dams themselves are  
14 maintained. I'm just hoping that there'll be a whole  
15 lot of detail in whatever level of the report that comes  
16 out.  
17 MR. KEENE: Okay. Thanks for your comment.  
18 Well, thanks everybody -- oh, one more.  
19 RALPH BRIGHT: We were encouraged a while back  
20 that we shouldn't have any standing water on our  
21 properties: West Nile virus. And now you're proposing  
22 setting up all these reservoirs in the area of standing  
23 water. That doesn't fit.  
24 MR. KEENE: Any other comments? Well, thank  
25 you everyone, for coming. We appreciate your attendance  
0041 and your input.  
1  
2 /////  
3 off the record 8:04 p.m.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

